

Appl. No. 10/021,216  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

New claims 8-13 are added. It is submitted that these claims are generically defined in Fig. 1 and are therefore within the elected species.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of Temple '055, Temple '028; Wojnarowski and Sakamoto. Reconsideration is requested in view of the following:

It appears that the Examiner has misunderstood the invention or the references. The Examiner states that Temple '055 discloses a step of plating the channel plate 1 thereby forming an additional plating layer 27 on the thin-film plating 25 on a portion that has not been removed by any laser beam, and that Temple '055 teaches that part of the thin-film plating layer is removed with a saw or saw cutting means and that it would have been obvious to have substituted the laser beam of Wojnarowski for the saw cutting means of Temple '055.

Assuming the channel in Temple '055 corresponds to a portion that is removed by a laser or a saw, the result is that the

Appl. No. 10/021,216  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

additional plating layer 27 is formed on a portion that has been removed rather than, as stated by the Examiner (and required by claim 1 and new claim 10), on a portion that has not been removed. Further, an undercut 17 in Temple '055 corresponds to a portion that is removed by a laser, the additional plating layer 27 is also formed on a portion that has been removed.

Thus, the art does not support the Examiner's position. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

As to the "desired thickness", there does not appear to be a teaching or suggestion in Temple '055 concerning which layer is thicker. If one refers to the drawings, Figs. 3(d) and 3(e) in Temple '055 show the layer 25 and the layer 27 have same thickness. It may be the rejection confuses a thickness of layer with a width or a length of layer. The thickness is not the same as the width or length.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present invention is completely different from the cited references, and that they do not show or suggest the present invention.

Appl. No. 10/021,216  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

Concerning new claim 10, this combines additional features, clarifying important practical aspects of the invention. The arguments above equally apply to claim 10. It is noted that, in claim 10, in the second plating step, the removed portion is not plated because a catalyst is also removed in the removed portion.

The present invention dispenses with a mask exposure process or photosensitive resist process. Further, it is possible to remove a thin-film layer (a first plating layer) by a laser with small energy because such layer is thin.

Claims 8, 9 and 11-13 refer to some additional features as described in the specification.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present invention is not shown or suggested by the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman  
& Chick, P.C.  
767 Third Ave., 25th Floor  
New York, NY 10017-2023  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No.: (212) 319-5101  
MJC/lid

Respectfully submitted,  
MARSHALL J. CHICK  
Reg. No. 26,853